

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00104 01 OF 03 241413Z

53

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W
----- 003747

P R 241145Z JUN 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0179

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 MBFR VIENNA 0104

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT : MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING OF
JUNE 19, 1974

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. AT ITS MEETING ON JUNE 19, THE
AHG DISCUSSED REPORT OF JUNE 18 INFORMAL SESSION WITH
EAST (MBFR VIENNA 87 AND 89). GROUP NOTED THAT
EAST APPEARED TO HAVE MOVED TOWARD WESTERN
PHASING CONCEPT BY AGREEING THAT A
DISTINCTION COULD BE MADE BETWEEN GROUPS OF
DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, WITH DIFFERENCES IN THE
OBLIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN BY THE TWO GROUPS. EAST
SHOWED APPARENT FLEXIBILITY ON WHICH PARTICIPANTS
WOULD BE IN GROUP REDUCING FROM OUTSET, AND WHICH
IN GROUP WITH REDUCTIONS TO BE IMPLEMENTED LATER.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00104 01 OF 03 241413Z

HOWEVER, ALLIED REPS ALSO NOTED THAT EAST STILL

TALKED ONLY OF STAGING THE IMPLEMENTATION, NOT THE NEGOTIATION OF INITIAL REDUCTIONS, AND THAT DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD STILL BE REQUIRED TO COMMIT THEMSELVES IN ADVANCE TO INITIAL REDUCTIONS OF EXPLICIT SIZE AND TIMING. GROUP AGREED THAT SESSION REVEALED SOME PROMISING LINES TO EXPLORE. BELGIAN AND CANADIAN REPS SUGGESTED THAT AHG PRESS NAC FOR TIMELY GUIDANCE ON ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS FORMULA. AHG ALSO APPROVED CHAIRMAN'S WEEKLY REPORT (MBFR VIENNA 92) AND TEXT OF PLENARY STATEMENT TO BE GIVEN BY CANADIAN REP ON JUNE 20. DURING DISCUSSION, ISSUE OF UK COMMITMENT TO FUTURE EUROPEAN POLITICAL INTERGATION WAS RAISED. END SUMMARY.

DRAFT PLENARY STATEMENT

2. CHAIRMAN (NORWEGIAN REP VARNO) OPENED MEETING BY CALLING FOR DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PLENARY STATEMENT TO BE DELIVERED BY CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) AT JUNE 20 PLENARY (SEPTTEL). AFTER MINOR EDITORIAL CHANGES, DISCUSSION CENTERED ON PARAS 17 AND 18 REGARDING DISTINCTION BETWEEN NATIONAL AND FOREIGN FORCES. NETHERLANDS REP (QUARLES) SUGGESTED ADDING REFERENCE TO EUROPEAN UNION IN PARA 17 TO STRENGTHEN WESTERN ARGUMENT THAT UK AND CANADA SHOULD NOT BE TREATED SEPARATELY FROM OTHER NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. UK REP (ROSE) OBJECTED ON POLICY GROUND, BUT ACCEPTED ITALIAN REP'S (CAGIATI) COMPROMISE TO INCLUDE SIMILAR POINT IN PARA 18, WHICH REBUTS ASSERTION IN JUNE 14 CZECH STATEMENT THAT BELGIAN AND NETHERLANDS FORCES IN FRG SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS "FOREIGN" FORCES IN DIFFERENT CATEGORY FROM "NATIONAL" FORCES. BELGIAN ACTING RE (WILLOT), SUPPORTED BY FRG REP (BEHREND), SUGGESTED ADDING SENTENCE THAT "WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WHICH ARE MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY DO NOT ACCEPT AMONG THEM DISTINCTIONS WHICH WOULD NOT BE COMPATIBLE WITH THEIR DECLARED

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00104 01 OF 03 241413Z

GOAL OF FUTURE POLITICAL UNION." THIS LANGUAGE WAS RECOMMENDED ON GROUNDS THAT IT WAS BASED ON THE ROME TREATY. UK REP (ROSE) OBJECTED TO THIS LANGUAGE, SAYING HE REALIZED THIS ISSUE CAUSED MANY DIFFICULTIES AMONG THE ALLIES AND THAT THEREFORE HE DID NOT WANT TO PURSUE THE ISSUE IN AHG. HE SAID HE COULD ONLY ACCEPT LANGUAGE REFERRING TO "CLOSER EUROPEAN INTEGRATION."

UK LANGUAGE WAS INCORPORATED IN TEXT OF PLANARY STATEMENT. PLENARY STATEMENT WAS SUBSEQUENTLY APPROVED BY AHG.

JUNE 18 INFORMAL

3. DISCUSSION THEN TURNED TO THE JUNE 18 INFORMAL SESSION WITH EAST (MBFR VIENNA 0087 & 0089). US REP MADE TWO POINTS TO SUPPLEMENT THE SUMMARY. FIRST, THE SUMMARY DID NOT PICK UP THE FACT THAT KHLESTOV'S PROPOSAL INVOLVED EQUAL NUMERICAL REDUCTIONS. HIS SECOND POINT WAS THAT, DURING LONG STATEMENT BEFORE ACTUALLY MAKING THE PROPOSAL, KHLESTOV TRIED TO MAKE IT APPEAR APPROPRIATE TO DISCUSS THE SCOPE OF REDUCTIONS AT THE SAME TIME AS DISCUSSING WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED FROM THE OUTSET. IN THIS CONNECTION, US REP NOTED THAT, IN BILATERAL CONVERSATION WITH US DEP REP, GDR REP (OESER) TOOK LINE THAT EAST WOULD TRADE OFF CONCESSION ON WHOSE FORCES WOULD REDUCE FROM THE OUTSET IN RETURN FOR WESTERN CONCESSIONS ON SCOPE OF REDUCTIONS. US REP SUGGESTED THAT THIS MAY BE WHY KHLESTOV HAD RAISED BROADER QUESTION OF SCOPE OF REDUCTIONS, AND THAT ALLIES SHOULD BE ALERT TO SEE IF HE DEVELOPS OESER'S LINE.

4. UK REP SAID HE FELT THAT THE EAST HAD MADE SOME DEFINITE MOVE ALLIED DIRECTION. HE NOTED THAT KHLESTOV, OESER AND KLEIN HAD PRIVATELY MADE POINT TO UK DELOFF THAT ALLIES SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT EAST HAD NOW MADE A MOVE. UK REP THOUGHT EAST HAD SHOWN FLEXIBILITY ON TWO POINTS, FIRST FALLING OFF DEMAND FOR IDENTICAL OBLIGATIONS
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00104 01 OF 03 241413Z

OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS FROM THE OUTSET AND, SECOND, IN ADMITTING THE POSSIBILITY OF TIMETABLE FOR REDUCTIONS. HE SAID HE RECOGNIZED THAT KHLESTOV TIMETABLE WAS SHORT, GIVEN ITS 1975 DEADLINE. NEVERTHELESS, THIS, WAS AN OPENING WHICH SHOULD BE EXPLORED.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00104 02 OF 03 241433Z

53

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W
----- 003926

P R 241145Z JUN 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0180

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 MBFR VIENNA 0104

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

5. CANADIAN REP OBSERVED THAT DURING KHLESTOV'S FIRST INTERVENTION, HE SEEMED TO BE ESTABLISHING FOR THE RECORD EASTERN POSITIONS, PERHAPS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, BEFORE INTRODUCING PROPOSAL. HE FELT MEETING WAS ENCOURAGING IN THAT IT ESTABLISHED TO SOME EXTENT THE SEPARATION OF US-SOVIET REDUCTIONS FROM THOSE OF OTHER DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. HE WAS SURPRISED THAT, DESPITE PRESENCE OF UK AND CANADIAN REPS, THERE WAS NO MENTION OF ARGUMENT THAT UK AND CANADIAN FORCES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOREIGN FORCES. HE ALSO THOUGHT IT SIGNIFICANT THAT IN PARA 37 KHLESTOV OMITTED "FROM THE OUTSET" IN REFERRING TO OBLIGATIONS TO REDUCE. HE SUGGESTED THAT EAST WAS PLAYING THIS CARD VERY CAREFULLY, AND THIS MAKES IT IMPERATIVE THAT AHG RECEIVE GUIDANCE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00104 02 OF 03 241433Z

SOON ON ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS FORMULA. ONCE GUIDANCE WAS RECIEVED, ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO USE IT CAREFULLY. HE CONCLUDED BY OBSERVING THAT EAST

APPEARED NOT TO BE IN TOO GREAT A HURRY.

6. FRG REP AGREED IT WAS INTERESTING REPORT, NOTING THAT EAST APPEARED TO AGREE THAT BULK OF FIRST STEP REDUCTIONS COULD BE TAKEN BY US AND SOVIET UNION. HE POINTED OUT, HOWEVER, THAT KHLESTOV PROPOSAL STILL INVOLVED ONLY STAGGERED IMPLEMENTATION OF REDUCTIONS AND THAT 1975 DEADLINE MEANT THERE WOULD NOT BE MUCH OF AN INTERVAL BETWEEN STAGES. HE SAID WHILE IT WAS ENCOURAGING TO SEE THESE POINTS RAISED IN INFORMAL SESSION, HESE MOVES WERE NOT UNEXPECTED. HE NOTED, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT SOVIETS HAD INDICATED TO HIM LAST DECEMBER THAT A FIRST STAGE OF REDUCTIONS WOULD CONSIST OF 20,000 SOVIETS, 15,000 US AND 5,000 FRG TROOPS.

7. FRG REP CALLED ATTENTION TO KHLESTOV ARGUMENT THAT SINCE CURRENT PROPOSAL FOR AN INITIAL STEP WAS COMPLETELY DIFFERENT FROM THE FIRST STAGE OF THE EASTERN NOVEMBER 8 PROPOSAL, WESTERN OBJECTIONS TO FIRST STAGE SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS WERE IRRELEVANT. HE STILL BELIEVED, HOWEVER, THAT CURRENT PROPOSAL WAS CHIP OFF SAME BLOCK AND SUGGESTED THAT ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO POINT OUT SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THIS PROPOSAL AND FIRST STAGE OF NOVEMBER 8 PROPOSAL. FRG REP CALLED ATTENTION TO FACT THAT KHLESTOV'S PROPOSAL FOR FIRST STEP REDUCTIONS INCLUDED ARMAMENTS, NOTING THAT KHLESTOV HAD PREVIOUSLY TOLD HIM INITIAL REDUCTIONS HAD TO INCLUDE ALL ARMAMENTS OR NONE. HE OBSERVED THAT THIS MIGHT MEAN THAT IF THE SOVIETS DEFERRED THEIR DEMAND FOR WESTERN ARMAMENT REDUCTIONS, THEY WOULD EXPECT THE ALLIES TO FALL OFF THEIR DEMAND FOR SOVIET TANK REDUCTIONS. HE CONCLUDED BY NOTING THAT EAST CONTINUED TO ARGUE THAT IN SPITE OF ALLIED NON-INCREASE OFFER, UNDIMINISHED SECURITY COULD BE SAFEGUARDED ONLY IF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS UNDERTOOK OBLIGATIONS
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00104 02 OF 03 241433Z

TO REDUCE.

8. BELGIAN ACTING REP AGREED THAT SOME MOVE HAD BEEN MADE BY EAST, BUT WAS UNCLEAR AS TO SUBSTANCE OF MOVE. HE SAID HE WAS SUSPICIOUS THAT KHLESTOV'S PROPOSAL WAS STILL WITHIN FRAMEWORK OF FIRST STAGE OF NOVEMBER 8 PROPOSAL SINCE BOTH TALK OF NUMERICALLY EQUAL REDUCTIONS OF ABOUT 20,000 MEN. HE NOTED THAT EAST SHOWED SOME FLEXIBILITY BY HINTING THAT BULK OF INITIAL REDUCTION

COULD BE BORNE BY US AND SOVIET FORCES. WHAT EAST MAY BE TRYING TO DO IS TO MARRY WEST'S FIRST PHASE PROPOSAL WITH EASTERN SYMBOLIC REDUCTION PROPOSAL, WITH POSSIBLE OUTCOME OF SUBSTANTIAL US/SOVIET REDUCTIONS AND EUROPEAN SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS. HE CAUTIONED THAT KHLESTOV'S PROPOSAL MIGHT BE A TRAP TO GET ALLIES AWAY FROM THE COMMON CEILING OBJECTIVE AND THEREFORE ALLIES SHOULD NOT GO TOO FAR IN SHOWING INTEREST IN THE PROPOSAL. HE SAID THAT, WHILE IT IS NECESSARY TO KEEP THE FIRE BURNING, ALLIES SHOULD DO SO ONLY BY ASKING QUESTIONS AND CRITICIZING KHLESTOV'S PROPOSAL.

9. BELGIAN ACTING REP SUGGESTED NEED TO EMPHASIZE POINT THAT ALLIES CANNOT UNDERTAKE A COMMITMENT TO REDUCE WITHOUT A FULL VIEW OF THE OVERALL SCOPE OF THE REDUCTION PROCESS. HE NOTED THE RISK THAT THE EAST MIGHT EXPAND THE DISCUSSIONS TO INCLUDE THE SCOPE OF REDUCTIONS, BUT SUGGESTED THAT IT MIGHT ALSO BE IN THE ALLIED INTEREST TO DO SO. IN THIS CONNECTION, HE THOUGHT AHG SHOULD ASK NAC TO ANSWER THE TWO QUESTIONS ON THE COMMON CEILING SUBMITTED BY AHG TO NAC ON APRIL 5. (COMMENT: THE REFERENCE IS TO THE REPORT CONTAINED IN VIENNA 2929, PART 3. THE FIRST QUESTION WAS WHETHER THE COMMON CEILING MIGHT BE EXPANDED TO INCLUDE AIR FORCE MANPOWER. THE SECOND WAS APPARENTLY THE QUESTION AS TO WHETHER A GROUND COMMON CEILING MIGHT BE ACCOMPANIED BY AN AIR AND SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00104 02 OF 03 241433Z

NUCLEAR FREEZE. END COMMENT.) IN ADDITION, BELGIAN ACTING REP NOTED THAT EAST HAS NOW USURPED WEST'S ARGUMENT ON DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REDUCTIONS AND THE NON-INCREASE FORMULA SINCE THIS FORMULA DOES NOT COMMIT ALLIES TO REDUCE. FINALLY HE URGED AHG TO PRESS NAC FOR GUIDANCE ON PARTICIPATION OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

10. ITALIAN REP (CAGIATI) STATED THAT HE COULD HARDLY SEE ANY MOVEMENT IN KHLESTOV'S POSITION. HE THOUGH HIS WAS A CLEVER EFFORT TO SELL THE OLD LINE AS A NEW AND IMPORTANT CONCESSION. THE ONLY NEW POINT WAS THAT US AND SOVIET UNION MIGHT REDUCE A FEW MONTHS OR EVEN WEEKS BEFORE THE OTHERS. THIS PROPOSAL WAS STILL LINKED TO THE NOVEMBER 8 PROPOSAL, DESPITE EASTERN COMMENTS TO THE CONTRARY. EAST IS NOT

REALLY TRYING TO REACH MIDDLE GROUND. THERE IS
A DANGER OF THINKING THEY HAVE MOVED
WHEN THEY HAVE ONLY BEEN FACELIFTING. ALLIES
MUST REALIZE THIS, FOR IF IT IS THOUGHT THAT EAST
HAS GIVEN SOMETHING, ALLIES MIGHT BE TOO TEMPTED TO
MAKE FURTHER CONCESSIONS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00104 03 OF 03 241423Z

53

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

OMB-01 SAM-01 DRC-01 /152 W
----- 003866

P R 241145Z JUN 74

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0181

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 MBFR VIENNA 0104

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

11. UK REP SAID HE WAS UNDER NO ILLUSION AS TO
THE SUBSTANCE OF THE EASTERN MOVE. THESE WERE
DELICATE DISCUSSIONS DESIGNED TO ELICIT NUANCES
AND INTERPRETATIONS. HE DID NOT BELIEVE EAST
HAD MADE A SUBSTANTIVE MOVE, BUT RATHER EAST
HAD OPENED A SLIGHT CRACK WHICH SHOULD BE PRESSED
UPON. WHILE THE PROPOSED TIMETABLE
MAY BE SHORT AND UNDEVELOPED, AT LEAST FOR THE
FIRST TIME THE EAST IS DISCUSSING STAGED REDUCT-
IONS WITH SOME COUNTRIES REDUCING FIRST. FURTHER-

MORE, THOUGH KHLESTOV DENIED IT, EAST NOW APPEARS PREPARED TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN TWO GROUPS OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN TERMS OF OBLIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN FROM THE OUTSET. HE SUGGESTED THAT ALLIES SHOULD TRY TO DISCOVER WHY KHLESTOV IS PREPARED TO MAKE THIS DISTINCTION. PERHAPS ALLIES
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00104 03 OF 03 241423Z

WOULD BE ABLE TO SUFFICIENTLY EXPAND KHLESTOV'S TIMETABLE TO ALLOW TIME FOR INITIAL REDUCTIONS TO BUILD CONFIDENCE BEFORE REDUCTIONS BY OTHERS TOOK PLACE. THESE ARE SOME PROMISING LINES TO EXPLORE, BUT EAST HAD NOT MADE SUBSTANTIVE MOVES AS SUCH.

12. FRG REP SAID IT IS CORRECT THAT KHLESTOV IS STILL TALKING ABOUT STAGGERED IMPLEMENTATION OF REDUCTIONS WITHIN ONE STAGE OF NEGOTIATIONS.

EVEN UNDER NEW PROPOSAL, ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS STILL HAVE TO COMMIT THEMSELVES TO THE FULL SCOPE OF REDUCTIONS. THEREFORE, IT IS NOT MUCH OF A MOVE ON THE PART OF THE EAST.

13. US REP AGREED WITH FRG REP'S COMMENTS, BUT POINTED OUT THAT KHLESTOV DOES APPEAR TO SEE A SECOND GROUP OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WHOSE SCOPE OF OBLIGATIONS WILL DIFFER SIGNIFICANTLY FROM THOSE OF THE FIRST GROUP. KHLESTOV ALSO SHOWED FLEXIBILITY REGARDING THE SIZE OF THE SECOND GROUP. US REP COMMENTED THAT THIS WAS AN INADEQUATE DISTINCTION, SINCE IT DOES NOT ADDRESS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN REDUCTIONS AND WITHDRAWALS. BUT IT WAS THE FIRST TIME THAT THE EAST HAS ADMITTED THAT SOME COUNTRIES MAY HAVE LESSER OBLIGATIONS.

14. CANADIAN REP AGREED WITH US REP, POINTING OUT THAT KHLESTOV HAD SAID THAT THE FIRST STAGE WOULD BE A SEPARATE AGREEMENT, BUT THAT NEGOTIATIONS ON FURTHER REDUCTIONS WOULD TAKE PLACE DURING IMPLEMENTATION OF FIRST STAGE. US REP SAID THE FACT THAT EAST ENVISAGES A SEPARATE FIRST STAGE AGREEMENT MEANS THAT THEY HAVE ACCEPTED THE CONCEPT OF PHASING. WHILE EAST HAS HINTED AT THIS IN BILATERALS, IT HAS NOW FOR FIRST TIME BEEN EXPRESSED IN A MULTILATERAL FORUM. FRG REP POINTED OUT, HOWEVER, THAT THE EASTERN SYMBOLIC REDUCTION PROPOSAL WAS ALSO
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00104 03 OF 03 241423Z

PRESENTED AS A POSSIBLE SEPARATE AGREEMENT, SO
KHLESTOV'S PROPOSAL WAS NOTHING NEW.

15. UK REP STATED THAT IT WAS TRUE THAT EAST
HAS NOT ADVANCE THE IDEA OF SEPARATE NEGOTIATIONS
OF REDUCTIONS TO BE MADE BY THE TWO GROUPS OF
DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, ONLY THAT IMPLEMENTATION
OF REDUCTIONS WOULD BE STAGED. NEVERTHELESS,
THERE HAS BEEN SOME MOVE TOWARD THE WESTERN
PHASING PROPOSAL. HE EMPHASIZED THE NEED TO
EXPLOIT THIS OPENING IN ORDER TO SET THE
SCENE WHERE ALLIES CAN USE THE ALL DIRECT
PARTICIPANTS FORMULA WITH GREATEST POSSIBLE EFFECT,
AS A FINAL BARGAINING LEVEL TO GET EASTERN
ACCEPTANCE OF PHASING.

16. ITALIAN REP ONCE AGAIN WARNED THAT
ALLIES SHOULD NOT DECEIVE THEMSELVES INTO THINKING
THAT THERE HAS BEEN MOVEMENT. HE DID NOT AGREE
THAT A PHASING CONCEPT HAD BEEN ACCEPTED BY EAST.
ALLIES SHOULD CHALLENGE EASTERN STATEMENT THAT
EAST HAS MOVED, JUST AS EAST HAS CHALLENGED
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ALLIED MOVES.

17. US REP DISAGREED, SAYING THAT IT WOULD BE
TACTICALLY WRONG NOT TO RECOGNIZE FACT OF SOME
EASTERN MOVEMENT. EAST HAS NOW MADE A SIGNIFICANT
STATEMENT IN A MULTILATERAL FORUM WHICH HAD ONLY
BEEN HINTED AT IN BILATERALS BEFORE, THAT THERE
CAN BE DIFFERENT GROUPS OF PARTICIPANTS WHICH HAVE
DIFFERENT OBLIGATIONS. ALLIES SHOULD THEREFORE
ACKNOWLEDGE THAT EAST HAS MADE A MOVE, THOUGH A
SMALL ONE, AND PRESS FOR A MORE SIGNIFICANT
MOVE.

18. NEXT AHG IS SCHEDULED FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 21. RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETING CHAIRMAN, NEGOTIATIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 24 JUN 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974MBFRV00104
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740165-0549
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740620/aaaaaqov.tel
Line Count: 480
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 20 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <20 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <09 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: : MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING OF JUNE 19, 1974
TAGS: PARM, UR, US, NATO, (KHLESTOV)
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005